DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 250 JC 830 266

TITLE	Revitalizing the Humanities in the Community Colleges: Final Report, October 1, 1979--September 30, 1982.
INSTITUTION	Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.; Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia. Div. for Information Services, Research & Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	82
GRANT	AS-00017-79-1409
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Curriculum; *Community Colleges; Courses; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Humanities; *Humanities Instruction; Information Dissemination; Program Descriptions; State Programs; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Course Taking Patterns; *Washington

ABSTRACT

A general summary is presented of the activities of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges during a 3-year project to revitalize the humanities in Washington's public community colleges. After introductory material, the Center's activities are described according to major functions, including: (1) to design and conduct a statewide survey on the patterns of curriculum and instruction prevalent in two-year college humanities instruction; (2) to conduct a survey of the status of the humanities in the community in which each college is located; (3) to survey student course-taking patterns and preferences; (4) to assist in developing procedures for training workshops and seminars for faculty members who pursue the project's objectives; (5) to develop evaluation methods to be used by faculty to assess the effect of humanities instruction on students; (6) to aid in the distribution of annual reports of project activities; and (7) to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the project. An evaluation of the effects of the project highlights an enhancement of faculty morale in the colleges where the surveys were conducted, the development of links among college personnel, increased connections between the humanities and occupational education, and problems of communication with state and local organizations. Appendices include campus evaluations of the project. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230250

REVITALIZING THE HUMANITIES IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FINAL REPORT, October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1982

Center for the Study of Community Colleges
Los Angeles, California

National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH)
Washington, D.C.

UC 830 266

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

National Endowment for the Humanities Project No. AS-00017-79-1409
"Revitalizing the Humanities in the Community College"
Grantee: State Board for Community College Education
Assisting Agency: Center for the Study of Community College

Final Report, October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1982

This is the Assisting Agency's final report on "Revitalizing the Humanities in the Community College" Project. It reviews Center activities by function over the three years of the Project. Detailed information on Project activities is available in each of the three annual reports. This report offers a general summary.

The Center staff was headed by Arthur M. Cohen. Miriam Beckwith took the lead in field relations including workshops and Florence Brawer managed survey design, analysis, and dissemination. Following is a summary of Center activities listed according to major functions.

1. Design and conduct a statewide survey on the patterns of curriculum and instruction prevalent in the humanities in two-year colleges

In Fall 1979 Center staff developed an eight page Faculty Survey containing among other items questions on instructional attitudes and activities related to the humanities. The survey was sent to all humanities instructors in the 27 colleges and to an equal number of non-humanities instructors - 1,458 surveys in all. Completed survey forms were received from 1,160 instructors. Center staff prepared an analy is plan, and the surveys were sent to the Management Information, Systems Division, State Board for Community College Education for keypunching and analysis. Three project reports based on the Faculty Survey were written by Center staff and disseminated to the Presidents, Facilitators, Occupational Liaisons, and Community Services Coordinators at all colleges. The survey results were also presented at the inaugural meeting of the Consortia representatives on April 8, 1980. An article, "How Faculty View the Humanities,"

based on this survey and highlighting the similarities and differences between instructors in Washington and their counterparts nationwide appeared in The Humanities and Sciences in Two-Year Colleges, a joint publication of the Center and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

To obtain baseline data on humanities curriculum by each college and for the system as a whole, Center staff used the Fall 1979 class schedule from each campus and recorded all humanities courses and sections. These same lists were sent to the Facilitator on each campus who provided tenth day and final enrollment figures for each course section. Written project reports on the findings of both the curriculum and the enrollment surveys were prepared, disseminated to the three-person teams plus the president on each campus, and placed in the ERIC system.

Fall quarter humanities enrollments and curriculum are now routinely gathered through the State Board's Management Information System and reported by college and discipline by the Humanities Project Office. Since such information is now computer generated, hand tabulation is no longer required in order to examine trends and patterns.

2. Design and conduct a survey of the status of the humanities in the community in which each college is located

In the first 15 months of the Project, Center staff drafted several versions of the community survey. These drafts were presented at Core Group meetings and made available to the Community Service Coordinators. At the December 2, 1980, Core Group meeting, the group decided that the Center should work individually with the college staff members who were interested and assist them in the development of a survey. The facilitators and community service coordinators in all the colleges were notified that Center staff were willing to come to the campus and conduct workshops on

designing, administering, and analyzing questionnaires. Such workshops were conducted at Clark College and Bellevue College and at Bellevue the drama chair and the Director of Evening and Continuing Education decided to pursue separate questionnaires to meet their own informational needs. A short audience survey on attendance at cultural events was developed by the drama chair with the help of Center staff, administered in May, 1981, and analyzed by college personnel. Center staff also worked on several occasions with the Director of Evening and Continuing Education in designing a survey directed at organizations involved in a variety of non-credit educational activities. By December, 1981, the instrument was ready to be field tested and procedures had been developed for administering it.

3. Design and conduct a survey of student course taking patterns and preferences

Two student survey drafts were developed by Center staff and presented to the Core Group during the first year of the Project. After the decision of the Core Group in December, 1980, to use the student survey with individually interested people, the Center worked with Clark College and Olympic College staff in tailoring a survey to their needs and in selecting a sample. Then in Spring 1981 when information on a broad cross section of students and their course taking patterns was deemed essential to the Project, and it became evident that individual campuses did not have the resources to collect and analyze such data on their own, the Center agreed to conduct a statewide student survey. A survey was drafted, sent to the Facilitators and Core Group members for comments, and then finalized. It was administered on November 18, 1981, to 6,162 students in 363 credit and non-credit courses at all 27 colleges. Center staff analyzed the results and disseminated the findings through written reports and a number of presentations.

4. Assist the Core Group in developing procedures for training workshops and seminars for faculty members who pursue the project objectives

At the initial Core Group meeting on April 8, 1980, members expressed the greatest interest in and need for workshops on the following three topics: formation of humanities advisory committees; proposal writing for campus mini-grants; and methods of integrating humanities into occupation programs. Responding to these needs, Center staff offered sessions on these topics at different locations in the state during May, July, and September. Then at the request of the Core Group at the September 1980 meeting, Center staff prepared some model workshop agendas, a list of resource people and exemplary programs to be utilized within a session, and an enumeration of Center responsibilities and the responsibilities of the host college or consortia.

In the second and third-year, Center staff conducted all or a part of 22 workshops on the following topics: forming and using lay advisory committees, integrating humanities into occupational programs, and collecting and utilizing data. These were held on 19 different campuses with the Facilitator (or someone else on campus) helping to set the agenda and publicize the topic and date among faculty and administrators. An all day competency-based humanities workshop led by Louis Schlegel and Roberta Vandermast from Valencia Community College (Florida) for faculty from all 27 campuses was sponsored by the Center in conjunction with Humanities '81. Descriptions of each of the workshops in the form of project reports were written by Center staff and disseminated to the three person teams and the president at each campus as well as being placed in the ERIC system.

5. Develop evaluation methods to be used by faculty to assess the effect of instruction in humanities on students

One type of evaluation was built into the Student Survey where self report items assessed the effect of enrollment in different types of courses on students' confidence in their abilities and progress along 14 general education objectives. These measures provide faculty in different curricular areas with an assessment of the relationship between course taking patterns and student growth. The Center staff has drafted an educational outcomes measure on humanities and liberal arts/general education achievement designed for community college students. The test will enable an institution to determine the kind of knowledge students have gained by enrolling in a liberal arts curricular program.

6. Aid in the distribution of annual reports of project activities

Dissemination activities have been an integral part of Center involvement in all aspects of the Project. Twenty-two Project Reports have been prepared and distributed to key people on all campuses and to John Terrey, David Story, and Stanley Turesky. These reports and the Yearly Reports have been placed in the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Both an ERIC topical paper and a video-tape dealing with humanities advisory committees in Washington have been produced by the Center and widely distributed through ERIC. A number of presentations on the Project and its activities have been given by Center staff at various regional and national meetings. A complete list of these presentations is included in each of the Yearly Progress Reports prepared by the Center.

The Center has actively encouraged faculty and administrators from various Washington colleges to participate in different conferences and workshops. Thus, both the Spring and Fall 1981 CCHA Western Division Conferences saw a large number of presenters and attendees from Washington. At the 1981 and 1982

NEH-AACJC "Integrating Humanities Into Occupational Curricula" Workshops in Los Angeles, the Project was represented by consultants and participating institutional teams from Washington. In addition, faculty teams from Fort Steilacoom and Spokane Community College participated in the CCHA sponsored 1981 Summer Institute "Integrating the Humanities and Business Education".

The Center has also been an effective catalyst in promoting increased interaction and communication among faculty at the same institution and with colleagues at other campuses. Faculty members are sharing their concerns and their strategies and extending their expertise to their peers through Center sponsored workshops, state-level meetings, the Consultant Registry Program, and informal networks. This sharing and cooperation is one of the most valuable and may be one of the most permanent outcomes of the Project and the Center's work.

7. Evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Project

Interim evaluations were incorporated into the first, second, and third-year progress reports. These partial evaluations revealed progress and helped steer Project activities. They showed how the individual grants for instructors stimulated much activity on the campuses and how new course development was undertaken. They revealed the problems in forming advisory committees to the humanities but also the positive steps that had been undertaken. Issues in disseminating information about the Project and in Project leadership were discussed. In general, the interim evaluations pointed repeatedly to the importance of local campus leadership. A project managed at the state level is useful for publicizing an activity across campuses and for offering a linkage system. But the project's impact on an individual campus is dependent largely on the form of leadership exhibited there.

What did the Project accomplish? The matrix on the following page, which is based on Project sponsored activities, summarizes the outcomes campus by campus. However, it is always difficult to assess a project's effect in a natural setting because it is impossible to determine what would have happened if the project had never begun. Still, it is reasonable to assume that certain specific activities promoted under Project auspices would not have occurred if a group of concerned people working under Project auspices had not been involved. For example, the several surveys that were conducted under Project management would not have been undertaken and the information those surveys revealed would not have been generated. Some of the unique ideas promoted within the Project would not likely have been pursued; the development of advisory committees to the humanities at the local campus level offers a case in point. Nor is it likely that a group of concerned practitioners would have formed a statewide humanities association if the Project had not built intercampus communication links.

The fact that the Project had some effect is not surprising. Any intervention is bound to accomplish something. The purpose of an evaluation is to trace the overall effects with the intent of providing direction for similar activities. This can be done by summarizing what was accomplished, speculating on what might have been accomplished, and attempting to link Project management and activities to the Project outcomes.

The Project's general accomplishments may be readily traced. It publicized and thus gave life to the humanities as a curriculum area in a network of community colleges that, for the duration of the Project, was undergoing severe hardship in the form of budget reductions, enrollment caps, and attendant personnel dislocations. Enrollments in humanities courses nationwide had already been reduced because of changing patterns of internal support and student intentions. Had the Project not begun its activities just as the Washington colleges were going into a time of fiscal decline, the humanities

	Survey and Report State of the Humanities												
	Curriculum and Enrollment Survey	Student Survey	Community Survey	Faculty Survey	Advance the Humanities in the Community	Form Lay Advisory Comm.	Join the Humanities with Occupational Areas	Raise Enrollments in the Humanities	Build New Interdisciplinary Courses	Invite New Projects in Humanities	Increase Number of Scholarships and Stipends	Facilitate Communication & Interaction between Humanists	Develop Models for Assessing Impact
Bellevue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 1 new offering	No	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Big Bend	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes 2 courses 1 offering	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Centralia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Clark	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Columbia Basin	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes Lecture/ Slides Modules	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Edmonds	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes Series of Modules	Yes	Yes 1 new course	No	No	Yes	Yes
Everett	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes 2 new courses	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Fort Steilacoom	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	In the process	Yes 1 new course	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Grays Harbor	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Green River	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	In the process	No	Yes	Yes 1 new course	No	No	Yes	Yes
Highline	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Lower Columbia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
North Seattle	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes 1 new course	Yes	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Olympic	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Olympia Technical	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes 1 new course	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Peninsula	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Seattle Central	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes 1 new offering	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Skagit Valley	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes 1 new course	No	No	Yes	Yes
Shoreline	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes Series of Modules	No	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
South Seattle	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes 1 new course	No	No	Yes	Yes
Spokane	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	In the process	Yes 1 new offering	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Spokane Falls	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes T.V. Matls.	In the process	Yes Lit. Modules	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Tacoma	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes New T.V. Course	No	No	Yes	Yes
Walla Walla	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes Series of modules	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Wenatchee Valley	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes 1 new course	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Whatcom	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	In the process	Yes 2 new courses	Yes	Yes 3 new courses	No	No	Yes	Yes
Yakima	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes T.V. Spots	In the process	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

might have suffered a devastating blow. The visibility given to the humanities during the three years of the Project, the support coming from the level of the state office, and the intercampus networks that developed among those practitioners who were dedicated to the humanities certainly helped to maintain this area of study.

The value of the Project for faculty morale cannot be overestimated. It provided a distinct morale enhancement for instructors who might otherwise have felt that their efforts and the subject areas they were teaching were distinctly undervalued. It allowed them to obtain small sums of money to undertake small projects of their own, and it encouraged them to work together on issues beyond the scope of individual instructors. It also awarded recognition for what they were doing, providing them with the rewards that come from public acclaim for individual accomplishment. The appended statements from some campus participants clearly indicate the importance of this aspect of the Project.

The development of communication links among practitioners in the various colleges was written into the Project proposal as an important function. This did occur. The parochialism of individual campuses was mitigated as instructors spoke with their counterparts at other colleges through the links developed within the Project. Isolation of the individual instructor was broken down. The invisible college that has tied university professors across disciplines has never been well developed in community colleges. An invisible college comprised of humanities instructors was started in Washington. This effect was greatest among instructors on the small and remote campuses.

The Project did much more than enhance faculty morale, as important as that was. It also stimulated the development of professionalism among the faculty as typified by the number of professional papers and campus proposals that they developed. The call for individual grants stimulated over 200 proposals. The Washington faculty prepared papers for delivery at such meetings

as the Community College Humanities Association, Western Region. A sizable group of faculty attended the CCHA meetings in San Francisco and the process of information transfer with other states was well-developed.

The idea of the humanities within the colleges was similarly affected in a general way. There were several moves to bridge the humanities with occupational education. Interdisciplinary courses were facilitated and the humanities in community services were stimulated as well. These activities were not as successful as some of the others, primarily because they depend on a professionally integrated faculty. That is, the development of faculty morale and a professional consciousness comes first; after that, the humanities instructors can take the lead in promoting humanities instruction in occupational and community service areas. Still the beginnings of those activities were seen and on some campuses were moved well along.

The intercampus connections were best develped through the activities sponsored by the Project. The annual conferences drew people together by allowing administrators and instructors from all the campuses to interact within the context of the activities the Project was attempting to foster. The Center for the Study of Community Colleges assisted this linking, extending it beyond the state through its effort in tying the Washington Project with the national Community College Humanities Association, the League for the Humanities, and the network of ERIC users. But the main intercampus link came through the Project itself, first the Core Group, then the Washington Community College Humanities Association. The WCCHA is a direct outgrowth of the Project. Its constitution reflects the language of the original Project proposal. It has enlisted members from the majority of the Washington community colleges and from a sizable proportion of individual faculty. This Association offers a form of intercollege linkage that bodes to continue well beyond the termination of the Project.

Could the Washington Project be exported to another state? Its positive accomplishments certainly suggest that it could and should be repeated elsewhere. Much depends on the characteristics of the various states. Washington's community colleges are funded in toto through the state. The State Board and the State Director have a pattern of influence that differs from the influences coming from the state capital elsewhere. The State Director himself is known as a devotee of the humanities. In brief, conditions among the states are never quite the same.

It is possible, nonetheless, to speculate on how a project to revitalize the humanities in another state's community colleges might be organized. A project leader with strong credentials within the humanities and in the community colleges should be selected. The leader could be a faculty person, an administrator, or someone from the state office. The important point is that the leader recognizes that his or her role is to gain support for the project from as many people as can be involved on each campus. This type of activity requires an individual who can be publicist, advocate, and agent of communication all at once.

The project should have funds for both general surveys and evaluations and for individual campus projects. The process of re-granting can be undertaken as a necessary step in enlisting support. Small grants of $2,000 or $3,000 to an individual instructor go far in enhancing morale. They serve also to foster professionalism by breaking down the isolation of the individual classroom. The statewide surveys enhance communication among instructors and between campuses, and are important for both publicity and communication. Community college instructors on their own typically tend not to remain conversant with developments in their field. It takes a project to help them build and maintain these communication links.

Early on in a project the key campus people from all the colleges should meet together to discuss what each is planning. This both shares ideas and serves to weld the group. From the group of key campus people the leaders of a statewide organization can emerge. For this reason these people must be selected with great care. The project leader should perhaps assist the presidents in selecting effective individuals for each position. A similar type project might also consider building in different types of rewards for campus people working on behalf of the project. Obviously, one reward is inherent in the project; namely, the opportunity to develop one's professionalism. But presidents could also award release time or some other tangible credit to people actively involved with the project. However, it is important to note that released time of itself does not necessarily foster the form of campus leadership that is required. Therefore, campus presidents should review selections after the first year at the project and replacements should be made where appropriate.

The Washington Project revealed certain problems, some of which may be attributed to the way it was organized. First, the Project was recognized early on as something that the faculty should become involved with. All to the good, but on some campuses the Project was shunted off to the faculty with only token involvement of the president or the dean. Accordingly, the faculty were on their own and the natural linking function performed by administrators was missing.

The Project managers did not link closely with administrative organizations throughout the state. The Washington Association of Community College Presidents heard reports on the Project but were not asked to take action on its behalf. Similarly the Washington Instructional Commission and the Trustees' Association were notified that the Project was in operation but were not asked

to work with it. An Advisory Group was never formed. Instead, its responsibilities were merged with those of the Core Group which worked out well. But this move eliminated the participation of the Washington Commission for the Humanities, the student services deans, and representatives from the four-year colleges and universities, and no other means of soliciting their interest and input were sought. Whether these groups would have made a positive contribution to the Project remains conjectural; however, some effort should have been made to include their representatives since they were potentially valuable partners in the broad task of revitalizing the humanities. In short, the building of the Project through the faculty at the grass roots level is an ideal way to conduct an effort on behalf of the humanities but linkage with existing administrative organizations and other groups should not have been overlooked.

Another problem arose in connnection with the campus teams. The three person team with a Facilitator from the humanities, an Occupational Liaison, and a Community Services Coordinator were designed to form bridges between the three areas. However, the selection of people was not structured or monitored well. At a WACCP meeting in September 1979, John Terrey discussed the Project and its organization and asked the presidents to appoint people to serve as members on the campus team. To assist the presidents in this task, Center staff prepared a list of responsibilities and requirements for each of the three positions. However, when Center staff first called each of the persons designated as campus facilitator, a few did not know they had even been appointed and some had minimal or almost no information about the Project.

The problem with the campus teams was compounded by a number of changes, including 12 new facilitators during the first two years of the Project. Some

shifts were serendipitous as creative and energetic people were brought in, but others were less felicitous. And in nearly all cases with these changes there was a loss in the continuity of the Project at the campus level, and the changes may have contributed to the fact that the teams did not function as intended. With only a few exceptions, the Community Service Coordinators and the Occupational Liaisons did not become actively involved. Consequently, the important links with these areas were not forged and the instructors in these programs were not encouraged to participate to the degree that they might have if the teams had been more effective.

Perhaps the most successful approach toward achieving campus wide interest and involvement in the Project was the one adopted at Whatcom. There the team concept was bolstered by an advisory committee whose members included the Deans of Instruction and Students; faculty from the humanities, social sciences, occupational and counseling areas; and a member of the Board of Trustees. This committee fostered communication about and support for the Project among a diverse group of faculty and administrators. Plus it provided the stimulus for faculty to pursue a large number of Project sponsored or Project spin-off activities including: one funded campus proposal; the development of some new interdisciplinary courses several of which are targeted for occupational students; attendance by both full and part-time faculty and several administrators at Humanities '81 and '82 to attend and to present at various sessions, and to receive each year an Exemplary Status award for two different interdisciplinary courses; participation in the AACJC-NEH sponsored "Strengthening Humanities in Occupational Curricula" workshop; and the use of two faculty retreats to develop a set of educational outcomes which has subsequently been adopted by the Trustees and placed in the college catalog. If a similar type project is funded somewhere else, the planners

might want to consider using a committee modeled on the successful one at Whatcom rather than the campus team organization.

The Project managers may have assumed too much latent campus interest. True, the humanities had been starved for attention but that does not mean that when the existence of a project is announced, all the proponents of the humanities leap to take part. For most faculty their first contact with, and the first information on the Project came with the Faculty Survey in November 1979. After that, faculty familiarity and involvement in the Project was, on many campuses, largely determined by the interest and actions of the facilitator in encouraging wider participation and in arranging Project related activities. It seems reasonable to assume that more initial publicity and a more systematic way of disseminating information might have stimulated greater faculty participation, particularly in the first year.

Insufficient intracampus publicity could have been overcome at least partially with personal visits from state level Project leaders. It might also have been mitigated if meetings of the Core Group had been held in different locations and/or open forums or speakers on the humanities in the community colleges were made part of the agenda of those meetings. This would have changed the character of the meetings so that organizational matters would take one part only and the other part would involve an open discussion of issues in the humanities. The important point is that they could have taken place on various campuses as a way of publicizing the Project throughout the state. This would probably had led to fewer Core Group meetings because of the greater expense of traveling to remote areas of the state but they might have been more useful meetings.

As mentioned above, the surveys served a useful purpose in publicizing the Project. The Faculty Survey introduced the Project to the instructors,

determined what the faculty might have expected from it, and invited them to participate. The results showed that individual grants and funds to link the instructors with their counterparts in other institutions were high on the agenda. The Student Survey revealed the importance of course requirements as a stimulus to enrollment but also pointed up the fact that at least one fourth of the enrollments were for the students' own personal interest. The conduct of these surveys was suitable to the intent; however, the dissemination of survey findings could have been pursued more vigorously. Each survey should have been followed with a personal meeting describing the findings to the various state level administrative agencies and to the staff at each campus. The need for interpretation and discussion was clearly seen with the humanities enrollment data. Reported and distributed in a numerical format with very little narrative explanation or interpretation, these data were largely ignored by faculty and underutilized by campus administrators. On the other hand, at those campuses where Center staff personally discussed the findings of the Student Survey, faculty and administrators were encouraged to examine the implications for their own educational programs and in some cases, make curricular changes based, in part, on the findings.

In general the Project was most successful in its development of a statewide organization and in its identification of concerned faculty members who were willing to devote their own time to the Project and to build the organization. It had several specific results as well, including the development of local campus advisory committees. These outcomes may mean much for the support of the humanities in the long run. The effects of the Project will be felt long after its termination.

APPENDIX A

Division of Humanities 478-4866

August 24, 1982

Art
Drama
English
Humanities
Journalism
Languages
Music
Philosophy
Photography
Speech

Dr. Randy Beckwith
Center for the Study
of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Ave., Suite 205
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dear Randy:

More often than not, any project has additional impacts separate from those originally anticipated by the planners. Such has been the case with my experience as a participant in the Washington State Humanities Project. Through my involvement in the project the following impacts--some observable, others less so--have been felt:

- a greater understanding of what the humanities are and their importance in our lives and community college education;
- a sense of kinship (rather than competition) with faculty and administrators on other campuses in Washington;
- the opportunity to experience some leadership capabilities heretofore untried;
- the knowledge that our situation was not singly felt -- that others were experiencing similar difficulties and that, together, we could find solutions;

·the opportunities afforded me to work with colleagues from other colleges outside the state;

·the vast array of information now at my disposal;

·the diversion of our attention away from the severe financial crisis we were experiencing in Washington; and

·the heightened visibility given our division and particular members via presentation at regional conferences, the awarding of Exemplary Status, and presentation for the State Board for Community College Education.

These are just a few of the powerful effects that the Washington State Project has had on me.

north seattle
community college
9600 college way north, seattle, washington 98103 634 4400

August 23, 1982

Randy Beckwith
Center for Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Ave., Suite 205
Los Angeles, CA. 90024

Dear Randy:

In response to your request for development of my belief that there are many intangible results worth noting from the Washington Community College Humanities Project, I will comment on these areas: 1) increased interaction within the Humanities Division, 2) increased interaction among divisions, 3) stimulation of general curriculum reform, 4) inspiration of professional development and increased morale. My observations relate to my experience with the Humanities Division and college faculty and administration at North Seattle Community College. I suspect, though, that you could hear similar observations from division chairmen on other campuses. I say division chairmen because I think that it is someone in an administrative position who is more likely to see general affects such as these I will discuss in this letter.

While increasing the interaction among faculty within the Humanities Division and within the individual departments within the Division may not have been perceived as a need to be satisfied when the proposal was written, I know that increased interaction was a need in the Humanities Division at NSCC in the Fall of 1979 when I assumed the position of Chairman and when I became Campus Facilitator for this project which had just been funded. The Humanities Division at NSCC is much like most divisions across the state; it contains the departments of art, drama, English, foreign language, music and speech. Other humanities disciplines are organized in the Social Sciences Division. The Humanities Project helped the faculty to clarify what humanities might mean and, in so doing, helped individual instructors think of ways that the humanities mattered to the students they were teaching and, thus, lead them into more interaction with colleagues in other disciplines because they discovered that they had the same kinds of problems and concerns. If there were a way to measure how much talking actually occurred, and if that had been done during the three year period covered by this grant, I believe that you would see an increase in the actual number of interactions between and among faculty in this division that related to improvement of curriculum. Just

getting the faculty to talk to one another, and then, secondly, getting them to talk to one another about instructional concerns is to me a significant and probably intangible result of the Project. While I could not argue that the Project is the only reason that this interaction has occurred, I believe it was an extremely useful vehicle for this result.

Just as interaction among faculty within the Humanities Division has increased, so has dialogue with other academic and vocational divisions. While it may seem unbelievable that faculty in the Humanities Division did not have frequent conversations with colleagues teaching humanities disciplines in the Social Science Division, that is my observation of the state of affairs when I came to NSCC and when we started the Humanities Project. It, together with such projects as international education and formation of a liberal studies curriculum committee, helped faculty start talking across divisions about instructional concerns. Again, if there had been an actual measurement of the frequency and content of contact between divisions, I think you could document my perceptions. Some specific examples of increased cooperation include: an English instructor and history and philosophy instructor working together to offer 15 credits in a time frame that served as integrated studies in the humanities--English, philosophy, history--for entering students in Fall, 1980. In Fall, 1982, we will have the philosophy and a different English instructor offering coordinated courses wherein students wishing to study English composition are advised to enroll in the beginning philosophy class, and the philosophy will serve as the reading material for the English class.

I believe that the Humanities Project has stimulated our interest in general education and our attention to curriculum reform. Certainly, the existence of a liberal studies curriculum committee served as a vehicle for examining degree requirements, but the material provided in the reports from the Center for Community Colleges and the information generated from the Project Coordinator's office was important to several of us administrators and faculty who are currently considering Associate of Arts degree requirements, interdisciplinary courses, general education requirements at NSCC, and the like. While curriculum reform occurs without such stimulation as the Humanities Project, I think there has been more informed and committed examination of degree requirements because some of us can disseminate to the rest of the campus what we have learned about humanities programs at other campuses, student views about humanities courses, and so on.

Finally, I think the Humanities Project has been significant in inspiring more professional development and in keeping morale reasonably high in our division, even though we have had to reduce the budget for each of the three years of the Project's existence. The activity of preparing preliminary proposals for the Project and then being selected to prepare a final proposal got more faculty involved in grant preparation than had ever occurred in this division. That activity generated lots of ideas for supplementary materials for classes that later were turned into curriculum development grants and submitted to the District Curriculum Grants Committee, and some of those have been funded.

In addition, it inspired us to apply for Washington Commission for the Humanities mini-grants; our division had never done that before. Furthermore, we have applied for an NEH Consultancy Grant (although now we have decided to withdraw that application and prepare a pilot grant instead) and a grant for ESL. While we did not receive the ESL grant, I think that our interest in grants has increased because of the Project.

Certainly, our participation in professional organizations has increased. The Project has provided annual meetings and an organization which has several members from our division. In addition, a few faculty who had not published articles previously, have published articles in professional journals or have articles that they intend to submit for a journal. Our efforts in writing-across-the disciplines would probably not be as far along as they are without the influence, even if indirect, of the Humanities Project. Through the Project, we were able to have consultants present workshops on this campus and since these workshops were open to the district, we had participation from three campuses and many divisions.

All of this activity such as increased interaction among faculty within and outside the division, preparation of grant applications, conducting actual campus projects funded by the larger project, participating in the annual meetings, reading the reports circulated throughout the division and campus, and reaping the emotional satisfaction of an exemplary award have kept the morale of this division surprisingly high in spite of serious contract disagreements during one of the years of the Project and significant decreases in the budget which resulted in loss of long-time part-time instructors. It is the influence on morale, my own as well as that of the faculty, which to me, has been one of the most unexpected yet most important intangible results of the Humanities Project.

I have tried to identify some of the major intangible results of the Project, but I suspect that I have not been complete. While it would be incorrect to assume that it is only because of the Project that certain things have been accomplished in our division and morale is reasonably high, I do think that the Project helped me lead the division in a way I might not have been able to do without it. Because of what the Project gave to me as the manager and leader of the division, to the professional development of the faculty in the division, to the enrichment of our curriculum, and to the lives of our students, I will be forever grateful.

Sincerely,

Marie Rosenwasser, Chairman
Humanities Division

MR:mw

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MEMO

TO: Harold Heiner

FROM: Jean Carmean

DATE: January 26, 1982

SUBJECT: Project Humanities Report

Although the Humanities Project still has two full quarters to run, I would like to summarize what Whatcom's involvement in the Project for the last two years has accomplished. Many of the effects have been "spin-off," and some are not easily measurable, but I include them because they may be as important as those which involve money brought into the institution and/or products produced for it.

The most obvious of these intangibles is the improvement in morale among humanities and social science faculty which resulted from involvement in a project which gave their innovations visibility. At the same time, communication between faculty in these areas and occupational faculty was improved because of the Project emphasis on integration of the humanities with occupational areas. Faculty who had never done more than exchange pleasantries sat down to exchange ideas and to discover how they might strengthen each other's programs. And it is still going on. Activities involving ALE and Liberal Arts faculty last spring strengthened communication between these areas as well. The formation of Whatcom's Project Advisory Committee, in addition to giving the local Project focus and integrity, also brought about communication among a diverse group of administrators, and transfer, occupational and support faculty as they worked first to establish and then to pursue a rationale, goals, and activities for the Project that would be appropriate to Whatcom's needs.

The success of this Advisory Committee is noteworthy not only because of what it has helped to accomplish locally, but also because it has and will continue to add to Whatcom's positive State and National image.

There was little recognition given to the Humanities Project in the first year of the grant, but in May of 1980 with the call for campus project proposals and with the selection of a faculty member to act as campus facilitator, the Project gained far more visibility at Peninsula College. Consequently, in the past two years there has been an increased awareness on the part of faculty and administration in the role as advocate for the humanities. Such awareness has given rise to greater participation in off-campus conferences, more use of outside consultants, and more recognition for the resources currently found on our own campus.

Last spring nine persons including the president of the college, the vocational education director and faculty attended Humanities 82 in Seattle. Even with lowered travel budgets, others attended a variety of conferences in and out of the state of Washington. Peninsula College is very isolated geographically and it is also out of necessity quite self-sufficient when it comes to day-to-day matters. Hence, for the faculty to attend professional conferences or meetings takes an extra ingredient. The heightened awareness as humanities professionals seems to have supplied such an incentive.

During the past two years a number of people have visited Peninsula's campus, bringing with them expertise in certain areas relevant to the humanities. For example, under the auspices of the Project two consultants with experience in interdisciplinary courses and in writing across the curriculum addressed portions of the campus. Additionally, two persons led animated discussions on bridging the gap between vocational and academic programs and on the forming of advisory committees. While no such committee yet exists, there is interest in interchange with the community at large. Results of this interest, for example, are the formulation of plans to create a brochure on humanities at Peninsula College and the English Department's initiation of a series of area English teacher colloquia.

Mini-courses or modules that connect vocational and academic departments have not yet been established, but the inclination for such activity is very much present.

Three of the most significant outgrowths of the Project are that people are more aware of what the humanities are and what they stand for, they are more knowledgeable and confident of their role as advocates for the humanities, and they are more cognizant of resources already at hand. An inventory of campus activities along the lines of the Humanities Project reveals an astonishing number of people across the curriculum who are making significant "individual" efforts. The challenge is to streamline the operation as well as to capitalize on the opportunity by bringing more of these people together into functioning relationships. The widespread pay-offs that the Humanities Project has helped people to comprehend have significant impacts on lives here in Washington and elsewhere. The newly-formed WCCHA, a direct result of the enthusiasm stimulated by the Project, should help to lead us into the challenges of the future.

Frederick S. Thompson, Campus Facilitator
Peninsula College

Communications Department
Spokane Falls Community College
W3410 Fort George Wright Drive
Spokane, Washington 99204
September 16, 1982

Randy Beckwith
Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Randy:

I promised to send you a letter concerning the effects of the humanities project on the Spokane Falls Campus. As we both know, the most important results are those for which often we have no varifiable data to substantiate our conclusions. I'd like to mention two such results that I feel occured here.

First, through the efforts of the center, humanities faculty met to talk of setting up a humanities support group--an "advisory committee." The fact that we discussed the needs for such a group heightened the concern for actively working for the humanities instead of simply allowing things to happen to us. It out us in a position to act rather than react. This, I feel, is crucial to our growth.

Secondly, the "Humanities 81 and 82" meetings brought eight people from the Falls campus to Seattle to meet with colleagues from across the state. Eastern Washington, and especially Spokane, is very defensive in that it constitutes a large spread out geographic area--probably similar to Fresno and the San Joaquin and tends to depend on internal solutions rather than shared information. By meeting with people in similar disciplines from all over the stan and by sharing our own successes, we have managed to erase some of this parochialism.

The project was a success thanks to people like you who worked tiredlessly with faculty and administrators. Thanks for your help, and good luck on other projects. I hope we meet again and can work together.

Sincerely,

Bryan West

Bryan West
Faciltator, SFCC

TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

September 10, 1982

Ms. Randy Beckwith
Center for the Study
of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dear Ms. Beckwith:

With the state's community college humanities project drawing to a close at the end of this month, I want to thank you for the work you have done to make that so successful a venture and to tell you of some of the ways the humanities faculty at Tacoma Community College have benefited from the project.

Receiving an exemplary status award obviously has meant a great deal for the faculty who have been working in the College's honors program. The award has also helped us successfully solicit money for three additional honors scholarships as well as get approved some important revisions to the honors curriculum. Thus, we will now have an even better program.

Most of the project's effects have been less tangible, however. For example, it has helped TCC's humanities faculty strengthen ties with their colleagues both on and off the campus. The latter outcome has been particularly valuable. Less measurable, but no less important, is the positive influence the project has had on the humanities faculty's attitudes about their work in general. Too often those attitudes are governed by thin lines at registration and a public that views the humanities as impractical or just plan unnecessary. With its initial call for projects in May 1980, with its awards banquets, its conferences, and its consultation service, the project has mitigated those negative influences. It has shown the faculty there is interest in, and support for, what they do.

Though the grant runs out at the end of this month, the good it has done for Tacoma Community College's humanities faculty, among others, will continue for some time.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 22 5900 S. 12TH STREET, TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98465
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

On behalf of those faculty members, thank you for all you have done to make the community college humanities project so successful.

Best regards,

Frank Garratt
Chairman
Humanities Division

FG:pl

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JUL 1 1983